



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,468	08/20/2003	Eric S. Barnes	A3175-US-NP	5956
75931 7590 01/28/2008 BASCH & NICKERSON LLP 1777 PENFIELD ROAD PENFIELD, NY 14526			EXAMINER KASSA, HILINA S	
			ART UNIT 2625	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/28/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/644,468

Applicant(s)

BARNES ET AL.

Examiner

Hilina S. Kassa

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/ are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>08/06/07 and 01/02/08</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment submitted on 10/29/2007 has been acknowledged. The Examiner also considered the IDS submitted on 08/06/2007 and 01/02/2007.

### ***Double Patenting***

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claim 3 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 23 of copending Application No.10/342610. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter claimed in the instant application is broadly disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any

patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter as follows:

An electro-photographic method comprising: (a) receiving a page description language (PDL) representation of a print job; (b) converting the PDL representation into a print job pixel map; (c) during the converting and responsive to identifying a reusable document component (RDC) hint, searching an RDC repository for a corresponding RDC pixel map, or a reusable underlay (RUL) and either integrating a found corresponding pixel map into the print job, or rasterizing the identified RDC to generate a pixel map, integrating the generated pixel map into the print job, and storing the generated pixel map in the RDC repository, and generating a RUL therefrom; electro-photographically printing the print job pixel map.

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that these limitations are variations of each other.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

4. Claims 4-7 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 24-27 of copending application No. 10/342610.

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 10/29/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

**(1) argument 1:**

Applicant argues that Seseck et al. does not disclose **"obtaining a list of document components from said page and identifying any non-cashed components"**

With respect to applicant's argument **"obtaining a list of document components from said page and identifying any non-cashed components"**; in paragraph [0049], Seseck et al. disclose the static and dynamic parts of the page. For example, in line 10-16, it is disclosed that a dynamic web-page may be a form with multiple fields to be filled in by user. Having said that, user's data entry is considered as the document components and the documents are identified as non-cashed components as the dynamic data does not get save unlike the static data. Therefore, the stated argument is covered by Seseck et al.

**(2) argument 2:**

Applicant argues that Seseck et al. does not disclose **"searching a cache of reusable underlays for underlays having the reusable document components needed by the page"**

With respect to applicant's argument **"searching a cache of reusable underlays for underlays having the reusable document components needed by**

**the page"**; in paragraphs [0034], Seseck et al. disclose a search or condition to check whether the reusable underlay or the web page received from client exists in the list in cache 166. Therefore, the stated argument is covered by Seseck et al.

**(3) argument 3:**

Applicant argues that Seseck et al. does not disclose "during the converting and responsive to identifying a reusable document component hint (), searching reusable document component repository for a corresponding reusable document component or composite reusable document component pixel map"

With respect to applicant's argument "**during the converting and responsive to identifying a reusable document component hint** (paragraph [0030], lines 8; note that a document gets converted to a particular page description language supported by the printer in a rendering process), **searching reusable document component repository for a corresponding reusable document component or composite reusable document component pixel map**"; in paragraph [0034], note that a check is made as to whether the web page received from server has already been stored by corresponding each file in cache to the URL of the web page. Therefore, the stated argument is covered by Seseck et al.

**(4) argument 4:**

Applicant argues that Seseck et al. does not disclose "**a page description language interpreter that receives the document description and parses the**

**document description into reusable document components and which combines said components into composites of reusable components and reusable underlays”**

With respect to applicant's argument **"a page description language interpreter that receives the document description** (paragraph [0030], lines 8; note that a document gets converted to a particular page description) **and parses the document description into reusable document components** (paragraph [0034], lines 7-13; note that the reusable document component is considered as the web page) **and which combines said components into composites of reusable components and reusable underlays”**; in paragraph [0072], note that a check is performed if the document has a dynamic portion, then the static portion of the document gets obtained from the cache and proceeds with printing after combining both. Therefore, the stated argument is covered by Seseck et al.

**(5) argument 5:**

Applicant argues that Seseck et al. does not disclose **"receiving a document description including at least one selected reusable document component and combining said components into composites of reusable components and reusable underlays”**

With respect to applicant's argument **"receiving a document description including at least one selected reusable document component** (paragraph [0034], lines 7-13; note that the reusable document is considered as the web page) **and**

**combining said components into composites of reusable components and reusable underlays**"; in paragraph [0072], note that a check is performed if the document has a dynamic portion, then the static portion of the document gets obtained from the cache and proceeds with printing after combining both. Therefore, the stated argument is covered by Seseck et al.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Seseck et al. (US Publication Number 2003/0086098 A1).

**(1) regarding claim 1:**

As shown in figures 2-5 Seseck et al. disclose, a method for creating reusable composite components from interpreted pages of rendered document during dynamic document construction (paragraph 30, lines 1-7) comprising:

obtaining a list of document components from said page and identifying any non-cached components (paragraph 31, lines 1-5, paragraph 49, lines 10-16; note that it is



disclosed that a dynamic web-page may be a form with multiple fields to be filled in by user. Having said that, user's data entry is considered as the document components and the documents are identified as non-cached components as the dynamic data does not get save unlike the static data);

        caching individual reusable document components rendered to their respective bounding box dimensions (paragraph 30, lines 6-11; note that a document gets rendered then get stored in the print-ready cache 166 as mentioned in paragraph 32, lines 5-7);

        permuting said reusable document components into composite combinations of reusable document components (paragraph 32, lines 1-9; note that the documents are stored in a print ready file cache);

        caching each of composite reusable document component rendered relative to each other in a bounding box of sufficient size to adequately contain the combination (paragraph 32, lines 1-9);

        combining reusable document components in their relative positions to form composite reusable underlays (paragraph 34, lines 1-13); and

        caching said composite reusable underlays rendered to full page size (paragraph 34, lines 13-16);

**(2) regarding claim 2:**

Seseck et al. further disclose a method for rendering pages having a combination of reusable components and non-cached components (paragraph 30, lines 1-7), comprising:

assessing said rendered page for the possibility of having an underlay-overlay pair (paragraph 30, lines 7-17);

searching a cache of reusable underlays for underlays having the reusable document components needed by the page (paragraph 32, lines 1-7; paragraph 34, 7-16, note that a search or condition to check whether the reusable underlay or the web page received from client exists in the list in cache 166);

if the correct reusable underlay is not found in cache then generating a composite reusable underlay from the reusable document components of said page and caching said RUL rendered to full page size (paragraph 36, lines 3-7);

creating a full page size overlay from the non-cached components that is retained until it is mated with the cached reusable underlay (paragraph 36, lines 7-11);

if the correct underlay is found in cache then retrieving the reusable underlay; and (paragraph 36, lines 7-11)

rendering, along with the overlay, the page therefrom (paragraph 37, lines 1-10).

**(3) regarding claim 3:**

Seseck et al. further disclose an electro-photographic method comprising:

receiving a page description language representation of a print job (paragraph 30, lines 1-5);

converting the page description language representation into a print job pixel map (paragraph 30, lines 5-7);

during the converting and responsive to identifying a reusable document component hint (paragraph [0030], lines 8; note that a document gets converted to a particular page description language supported by the printer in a rendering process), searching a reusable document component repository for a corresponding reusable document component or composite reusable document component pixel map (paragraph 35, lines 1-4; note that a check is made as to whether the web page received from server has already been stored by corresponding each file in cache to the URL of the web page), or a reusable underlay and either integrating a found corresponding pixel map into the print job, or rasterizing the identified reusable document component to generate a pixel map, integrating the generated pixel map into the print job, storing the generated pixel map in the reusable document component repository, and generating a reusable underlay therefrom (paragraph 37, line 1-10); and

electro-photographically printing the print job pixel map (paragraph 39, lines 1-4; note that the printer could be multi-functional printer paragraph 21).

**(4) regarding claim 4:**

Seseck et al. further disclose the electro-photographic method as in claim 3, further comprising maintaining a repository index identifying contents of the reusable document component repository, wherein the step of searching of the reusable document component repository for a pixel map includes searching the repository index (paragraph 36, lines 1-11).

**(5) regarding claim 5:**

Seseck et al. further disclose the electro-photographic method as in claim 3, wherein the integrating of a found corresponding pixel map into the print job pixel map includes: marking the found corresponding pixel map in the reusable document component repository to prevent its deletion prior to the integrating of the found corresponding pixel map into the print job pixel map (paragraph 46, lines 1-13).

**(6) regarding claim 6:**

Seseck et al. further disclose the electro-photographic method as in claim 3, wherein the converting of the page description language representation into a print job pixel map includes: compressing the print job pixel map during the converting; and prior to the optical drawing, decompressing the compressed print job pixel map (paragraph 37-39, lines 1-4; note that in paragraph 37, the PDL gets pre-rendered and stored as shown in paragraph 38).

**(7) regarding claim 7:**

Seseck et al. further disclose the electro-photographic method as in claim 3, wherein the page description language is one of Variable data Intelligent Postscript Printware language and Personalized Print Markup Language (paragraph 19, lines 12-17).

**(8) regarding claim 8:**

Seseck et al. further disclose an apparatus for processing documents each represented by a document description encoded in a page description language supportive of reusable data (paragraph 30, lines 1-7), comprising:

a page description language interpreter that receives the document description (paragraph [0030], lines 8; note that a document gets converted to a particular page description) and parses the document description into reusable document components and which combines said components into composites of reusable components and reusable underlays (paragraph 34, lines 7-16, paragraph [0072], note that a check is performed if the document has a dynamic portion, then the static portion of the document gets obtained from the cache and proceeds with printing after combining both);

an imager, communicating with the interpreter, that creates image representations of received document components (paragraph 39, lines 1-4); and

a reusable document component repository that stores image representations derived from a plurality of processed documents, the reusable document component

repository communicating with the interpreter and the imager to supply those ones of the image representations corresponding to selected document components of the processed documents and to receive selected image representations created by the imager during the processing of documents (paragraph 47, lines 1-21);

**(9) regarding claim 9:**

Seseck et al. further disclose the apparatus for processing documents as in claim 8, further comprising a graphical user interface through which an associated user manages the reusable document component repository (paragraph 49, lines 1-10), the managing including selectively adjusting a repository storage size and selectively deleting image representations (paragraph 46, lines 1-7).

**(10) regarding claim 10:**

Seseck et al. further disclose the apparatus for processing documents as in claim 8, further comprising a compressor that receives and compresses image representations created by the imager (paragraph 49, lines 10-22), and communicates the compressed image representations to the reusable document component repository (paragraph 49, lines 22-27).

**(11) regarding claim 11:**

Seseck et al. further disclose the apparatus for processing documents as in claim 10, wherein the compressor is integrated into the imager (paragraph 49, lines 14-16; note that the print ready file is part of the printer).

**(12) regarding claim 12:**

Seseck et al. further disclose the apparatus for processing documents as in claim 8, further comprising a random access memory cache communicating with the interpreter and the reusable document component repository, the random access memory storing at least one most recently used image representation retrieved by the interpreter (paragraph 37, lines 1-10).

**(13) regarding claim 13:**

Seseck et al. further disclose the apparatus for processing documents as in claim 8, further comprising a repository index that indexes image representations stored in the reusable document component repository, the repository index communicating with the interpreter to identify images to be retrieved (paragraph 34, lines 16-24).

**(14) regarding claim 14:**

Seseck et al. further disclose the apparatus for processing documents as in claim 13, further comprising a ping path between the interpreter and the reusable document component repository by which the interpreter pings the reusable document component

repository responsive to the repository index indicating that a selected image representation is contained in the reusable document component repository (paragraph 34-35), the pinging directing the reusable document component repository not to delete of the selected image representation (paragraph 46, lines 1-14).

**(15) regarding claim 15:**

Seseck et al. further disclose the apparatus for processing documents as in claim 14, wherein the repository index is integrated into the page description language interpreter (paragraph 37, lines 1-5; note that the repository index is considered as the web browser).

**(16) regarding claim 16:**

Seseck et al. further disclose the apparatus for processing documents as in claim 8, further comprising a printing station that includes the page description language interpreter (paragraph 64, lines 1-2), the imager (266, figure 5; paragraph 64, line 2), and the reusable document component repository (278, figure 5; paragraph 65, lines 1-d1-6); and an electronic network by which the printing station receives documents for processing (264, figure 5; paragraph 64, lines 4-6).

**(17) regarding claim 17:**

Seseck et al. further disclose a document construction method comprising:



receiving a document description including at least one selected reusable document component (paragraph [0034], lines 7-13; note that the reusable document is considered as the web page) and combining said components into composites of reusable components and reusable underlays (paragraph 34, lines 7-16, paragraph 72, note that a check is performed if the document has a dynamic portion, then the static portion of the document gets obtained from the cache and proceeds with printing after combining both);

querying a reusable document component repository containing stored image representations of reusable document components to locate a selected stored image representation corresponding to the selected reusable document component (paragraph 35, lines 1-9);

conditional upon the querying,

identifying one of the stored image representations as corresponding to the selected reusable document component and retrieving the selected stored image representation corresponding to the selected reusable document component (paragraph 36, lines 1-7), or,

not identifying one of the stored image representations as corresponding to the selected reusable document component, generating an image representation for the selected reusable document component, and storing the generated image representation in the reusable document component repository (paragraph 36, lines 7-11); and

converting the document description to a document image representation, the converting including incorporating the selected or generated image representation corresponding to the selected reusable document into the document image representation (paragraph 37, lines 1-10).

**(18) regarding claim 18:**

Seseck et al. further disclose the document construction method as in claim 17, wherein the step of storing the generated image representation in the reusable document component repository includes associating a life span parameter with the generated image representation (paragraph 46, lines 1-7); and responsive to an expiration of the life span parameter, removing the corresponding generated image representation from the reusable document component repository (paragraph 46, lines 1-13).

**(19) regarding claim 19:**

Seseck et al. further disclose the document construction method as in claim 18, wherein the step of associating a life span parameter with the generated rasterized image includes associating one of a temporal life span and an indication of permanence with the generated image representation (paragraph 45, lines 10-21).

**(20) regarding claim 20:**

Seseck et al. further disclose the document construction method as in claim 18, wherein the life span parameter is such that the generated image representation remains available in the reusable document component repository for reuse in the construction of subsequent documents (paragraph 47, lines 1-21).

**(21) regarding claim 21:**

Seseck et al. further disclose the document construction method as in claim 17, responsive to a selected user input, further comprising removing the generated image representation from the reusable document component repository (paragraph 46, lines 1-7).

**(22) regarding claim 22:**

Seseck et al. further disclose the document construction method as in claim 17, wherein the querying includes tracking previously generated image representations (paragraph 35, lines 1-9); and conditional upon the tracking indicating that a previously generated image representation corresponds to the selected reusable document component, verifying the previously generated image representation currently resides in the reusable document component repository (paragraph 53, lines 1-13).

**(23) regarding claim 23:**

Seseck et al. further disclose the document construction method as in claim 22, wherein the querying further includes conditional upon a successful verifying, marking the previously generated image representation to prevent a removing thereof (paragraph 45, lines 16-21).

**(24) regarding claim 24:**

Seseck et al. further disclose the document construction method as in claim 17, wherein the storing of the generated image representation in the reusable document component repository includes, prior to the storing, compressing the image (paragraph 37, lines 1-10; note that the print data gets ripped before it is cached).

**(25) regarding claim 25:**

Seseck et al. further disclose the document construction method as in claim 17, further comprising storing at least a portion of the reusable document component repository in a random access memory cache (280, 288, figure 5; paragraph 65, lines 1-6).

**(26) regarding claim 26:**

Seseck et al. further disclose the document construction method as in claim 17, further comprising storing the reusable document component repository on a permanent

storage device; and storing most recently accessed image representations in a random access memory cache (paragraph 65, lines 1-17).

**(27) regarding claim 27:**

Seseck et al. further disclose the document construction method as in claim 17, further comprising identifying the selected reusable document component as reusable by detecting a reusable document component hint associated with the reusable document component (paragraph 52, lines 1-8).

**(28) regarding claim 28:**

Seseck et al. further disclose the document construction method as in claim 27, wherein the document description is encoded in a Variable data Intelligent Postscript Printware language (paragraph 30, lines 1-7).

**(29) regarding claim 29:**

Seseck et al. further disclose the document construction method as in claim 27, wherein the document description is encoded in a Personalized Print Markup Language (paragraph 19, lines 12-17).

***Conclusion***

8. The Examiner is not only relying upon the cited text but also, the overall prior art. Please consider the entire document.

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Hilina Kassa whose telephone number is (571) 270-1676.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler L. Haskins could be reached at (571) 272-7406.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Application/Control Number:  
10/644,468  
Art Unit: 2625

Page 22

**Or faxed to:**


**(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)**

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,  
Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or  
proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office  
whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Hilina Kassa

January 22, 2007



TWYLER LAMB HASKINS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER